

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 278

HE 027 294

AUTHOR Button, H. Warren; Corby, Betsey C.

TITLE SUNY's Centralization: Normal Schools as Precedents.

PUB DATE Apr 91

NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at "The Coming of the State University of New York" Conference (Brockport, NY, April 1991).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Centralization; College Administration; Educational Finance; Educational History; *Governance; Higher Education; *Politics of Education; Progressive Education; Public Education; School Effectiveness; State Aid; State Colleges; Teacher Education

IDENTIFIERS *New York; *Normal Schools; State University of New York

ABSTRACT

This report presents the historical background of New York State's normal school system, the system that predated the centralized organization of the State University of New York (SUNY) system. New York's first state normal school was established in Albany in 1844. Nineteen years later the state began to provide support for the normal school at Oswego. In the next 8 years, six more state normal schools were established; four more would be established later. Several of the normal schools formerly academies had already been under minimal control by the Regents. As normal schools they were subject to the control of the Superintendent of Schools, although their trustees retained considerable power. Central control was increased and became almost complete during the administration of Andrew S. Draper as Superintendent and Commissioner. Under progressive state governors and during the Depression, control of the normal schools by the State Department of Education increased further. (In the 1930s and early 1940s it was only slightly relaxed.) When the normals became the first components of SUNY, the State Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education became Executive Dean in SUNY, bringing with him the precedents of centralization. Contains 53 reference notes. (Author/GLR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

H. Warren Button and Betsey C. Corby, "SUNY Centralization: Normal Schools as Precedents." Paper presented at "The Coming of the State University of New York" Conference held at SUNY College at Brockport, sponsored by the History of the State University of New York Project, April, 1991.

SUNY'S CENTRALIZATION: NORMAL SCHOOLS AS PRECEDENTS

H. Warren Button, University at Buffalo

Betsey C. Corby, University at Buffalo

Abstract

New York's first state normal school was established in Albany in 1844. Nineteen years later the state began to provide support for the normal school at Oswego. In the next eight years six more state normal schools were established; four more would be established later. Several of the normal schools formerly academies had already been under minimal control by the Regents. As normal schools they were subject to the control of the Superintendent of Schools, although their trustees retained considerable power.

However, the extent of central control increased. While Andrew S. Draper was Superintendent and Commissioner central control of the normal schools became almost complete: Draper, as city superintendent and university president, had been a staunch supporter of "professional," i.e. administrative, control of schools and of centralization of control: That general view was part of the progressive ethos, and the precedents for central control had been set.

Under progressive state governors and during the Depression control of the normal schools by the State Department of Education if anything increased; in the 1930s and early 1940s it was relaxed only slightly. When the normals became the first components of SUNY the state Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education became Executive Dean in SUNY, bringing with him the precedents of centralization.

44-627294
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 Office of Educational Research and Improvement
 EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
 This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
 • Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
 MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Warren Button

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
 INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SUNY'S CENTRALIZATION: NORMAL SCHOOL CONTROLS AS PRECEDENTS

H. Warren Button

Betsey C. Corby

State University of New York at Buffalo

State University of New York is a heavily centralized organization. Some may see this as a virtue: Some see it as a failing. But advantage or disadvantage is not to be debated here. Our hope is to explain one origin of this centralization, whatever its advantages, whatever its costs.

SUNY's organization did not rise full blown from the sea like Botticelli's Venus, but, unless it is a wild exception, rests in part upon precedents which became 'customs of the mind' long before SUNY's establishment. We are interested in precedents that led to the centralization of control of public higher education in New York and the circumstances under which those precedents were set. We are especially interested in the normal schools, since they were the most important original components of State University of New York, and important precedents were set there.

Granted, several other factors have also contributed to SUNY's centralization. SUNY's centralization is related to New York's centralization of public education generally. It can be argued that SUNY's centralization is an outcome of the statute of 1948 that established it. It seems to one borne and bred outside New York State that State University of New

York's centralization comes in part from the ethos of New York State government, its apparently imperative need to protect the commonweal against fools and knaves, and the conviction that it can best be protected by state officials in Albany. It is agreed that State University of New York's organization is in part an outcome of the efforts of strong and determined men, although organizations also shape those within them. To put it more generally, the form of any governmental organization is an outcome of statute and regulations, the environment, politics, and the impact of individuals. But having said this, it is to be repeated that the forms of organizations are also shaped and maintained by precedents, by their history and by their origins.¹

The Making of the Normal Schools

The model for normal schools in the United States was the teacher training "seminaries" in Prussia, which several Americans visited in the 1820s and 1830s and reported upon enthusiastically. The first state funded normal schools opened in Massachusetts in 1839. New York's first state supported normal school was established in Albany in 1844. Before that, according to one source, the preparation of teachers in New York State had begun in the Lancastrian or monitorial schools. A statute of 1834 specifically authorized the Regents to make allocations from the state's Literary Fund for academy "teacher training" classes. Teacher training classes in academies and, increasingly, high schools, would continue into the twentieth

century.² It would not be too much in error to see the normal schools at their beginning as specialized academies, with larger state allocations than other academies.

By 1900 there were twelve state normal schools in New York State. Massachusetts, which had had the first normal schools, had ten. Pennsylvania's normal schools, established under terms of a legislative act of 1857, were still owned and managed by local stockholders and trustees.³ By 1914 there would be in the United States 177 state supported normal schools, as well as city, county, and private normal schools.⁴

In the order in which the normal schools received operating funds from New York State: Albany (1844), Oswego (1863), Fredonia (1868), Brockport (1868), Cortland (1868), Potsdam (1869), Buffalo (1870), Geneseo (1871), New Paltz (1886), Oneonta (1889), Plattsburg (1890), Jamaica (1897).

The New York State normal schools had varied origins: Albany, one of the first American normal schools, and originally experimental in nature, had been established as a state school in 1844. Oswego had been a city normal school. Fredonia, Potsdam, Cortland, and New Paltz replaced academies. Three of the normal schools would have "academic" (secondary school) departments, and four others academic (academy) students.

A letterbook and some of the minutes of the Brockport Collegiate Institute and the Brockport Normal and Training School have survived. The Collegeiate Institute, an academy, had replaced a still earlier college that had closed in 1837. A

corporation sold stock for \$3,450 and raised \$850 in gifts, and purchased the buildings and grounds of the defunct college. Its board of trustees voted to accept "provisions at market prices" in payment for part of students' board bills and named a principal who was to live in the Collegiate building and pay an annual rent of \$200 for it, and apparently was to pay faculty salaries from tuitions. He did not attend the meetings of the trustees. After his death the trustees collected contributions to pay for his tombstone. In 1859 a trustee's committee approved a course of study, typical for academies, if there can be a generalization about schools so diverse.

Higher Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry and Surveying, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Psychology, Astronomy, Botany, Geology, Analytical Parsing, Rhetoric, English Literature, Elements of Criticism, General History, Science of Government, Political Economy, Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, Analogy of Religion, Evidences of Christianity[.] Composition and Declamation throughout the course. Latin and Greek or either or the Modern Languages may be substituted for Trigonometry, Surveying, Botany, Elements of Criticism, Analogy of Religion or any of them.⁵

By 1869 Brockport Collegiate Institute's capital of \$4,300 had been transformed into a debt of \$14,000. The trustees persuaded the village to pay the Institute's debts and to build two wings so that the Institute building could accommodate a normal school, stipulating that academy instruction be continued.

The location of the other normal schools also depended upon the enthusiasm and support of "boosters," as Boorstin has called them, men, generally of substance, intent on enhancing their communities (and perhaps profiting thereby).⁶ Villages

and counties, bidding for the schools, contributed tax money, gifts, buildings, and grounds. They sometimes added, as Brockport did, stipulations as to the continuance of "academic" (academy secondary level) instruction. An obvious exception was the location of the first normal school in the state capital. There is some evidence that the location of a normal school in Fredonia was the result of political favoritism.⁷

Like many academies, each of the normal schools had what came to be called a "local board," whose members were generally local citizens. They were, naturally, advocates of their schools, sometimes zealous in the exercise of their duties and rights. The membership of Albany's local board was the exception. From its beginnings the New York State superintendent of schools had been an ex-officio member and chairman of its board of trustees, and secretaries of the Board of Regents were also board members.⁸

The normal schools were, then, a mixed lot, with varying traditions, curricula, admission requirements, and calendars. But after 1910 they had identical admission requirements, identical calendars, and often identical budgets: The control of the normal schools had been almost completely centralized. Our central question is how the centralization took place.

Centralization: The Beginnings

Academies in New York State were to some degree subject to control by the Regents when they were recipients of payments from the Literary fund. Increased centralization of control

of the normal schools began with their receipt of appropriations or "apportionments." In the first year of its operation the Brockport Normal and Training School's longtime secretary, Daniel Holmes, was told by State Superintendent Abram B. Weaver that the school's annual report was not in order:

Enclosed you will find a blank form to be filled out, stating the amount actually received and paid, during the year ending September 30, 1869, and not including any dues or indebtedness. Numbers 5 and 10 should balance...

Weaver also objected to a pay raise the trustees had granted a Miss Thompson: "The salary list of the Brockport Normal School is already very large... and it seems not prudent to increase the same... and must, therefore, decline to approve the resolution asking for an increase in Miss Thompson's salary."¹⁰

Two years later Weaver asked about Brockport Normal and Training School's gas bill: "It seems to me that your [illuminating] gas bills are unusually large. Is gas used in the dormitories or boarding hall, and charged to the state?" Holmes enumerated the uses of the gas; Weaver accepted the explanation, except perhaps for the gas used to light the chapel for a lecture series sponsored by students.¹¹

Control accompanying funds may have been inevitable; the chartered academies, some of which were the antecedents of the normal schools, had come under increased control by the Regents when they allocated state funds for support. To pay the piper is to call the tune, after all. More bluntly, money is power. But the convolutions of the thinking of the State Comtroller

were harder to understand. Daniel Holmes, secretary of the Brockport local board, explained one of them, sounding somewhat testy. The copy in the letterbook reads:

D Sir:

Please receipt the enclosed bill & also send me a duplicate received bill. There is no use of ever presenting us with a bill unless you receipt it and make it out in duplicate as we must have one bill here and the Comptroller another. Please bear this in mind in the future.

Yours &c

D Holmes
Sec'y, Local Board¹²

Financial support by the state led to the first phase of centralized control. The success or failure of the normal schools was dependent upon legislative appropriations. Their spokesmen often petitioned the legislature for increased appropriations, which were occasionally made. Despite political efforts by important intermediaries, the state appropriations were, to use a kind word, modest.

Because of agreements made when the normal schools were founded, and perhaps because of communities large initial contributions, the local boards considered themselves to have complete authority in some matters, and state superintendents sometimes yielded to the local boards. As board members and state superintendents changed, conflict over the shared management developed. As an early, admittedly minor instance, there was a query from State Superintendent Abram Weaver as to the qualifications of two nominees for Brockport's faculty: "Before taking action upon the nomination of Mr. W. H. Lennon

and Miss Fanny Barnett... I desire to see testimonials in relation to the fitness for and abilities to perform their duties...." Weaver later acquiesced to their appointment.¹³

Superintendent Neil Gilmour seemed especially intent on reducing the power of the normal schools' local boards. His attempt in 1877 to close the academic (non-pedagogy) departments in all the normal schools was not a minor matter. Brockport, Cortland, Fredonia, and Potsdam protested vigorously. The local boards argued that the maintaining of academic departments had originally been agreed upon, and fought and gained a reversal of Gilmour's order.¹⁴

At the Cortland State Normal another conflict ended only after years in court. Gilmcur's view of control was much different than Superintendent Weaver's, who he had replaced as state superintendent in 1874. The first indication of a conflict at Cortland came when the local board recommended an appointee for a board vacancy. By precedent, the Superintendent would have routinely approved.¹⁵ However, Gilmour did not respond to the request and appointed his own candidate. The board acquiesced, but in June, 1880 when Gilmour asked for the resignation of Principal James H. Hoose. Hoose and the Cortland board flatly refused to comply with Gilmour's wishes. Gilmour appointed J. M. Cassety as principal and ordered the teachers to report to him; any teacher who refused would be dismissed. The local board promised to dismiss teachers who did not report to Hoose. Fearing an attempt to seize the building in the night,

Hoose's friends guarded the door. Janitor Sid Gooding stood guard with a pistol, it was said. On September 7, Gilmour formally closed the school.¹⁷ A court issued an order in Gilmour's favor which was upheld on appeal, but Hoose did not accept defeat. In 1882 the Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the lower courts, ruling that the normals were local schools and that their boards were not subordinate to the state superintendent. Hoose was restored as principal.¹⁸

Nevertheless, State Superintendent Gilmour and Superintendent (later Commissioner) Draper did reduce the power of the local boards, and the normal schools came under near-complete control of the state superintendent and legislature.

The Legislature also exerted pressure, at least at times. There were the appropriations, and sometimes specific riders to appropriations. In 1872 a rider stipulated that two men, a Mr. Braman [?] and a Mr. Chriswell be appointed to the Brockport local board. For thirteen years, from 1871 until 1884, the normal schools' operating budgets, \$18,000 a year, were identical. But these actions were only the preliminaries.¹⁹

It is to be added that, although the normal schools were in some ways different, special purpose institutions, they were seen as more like public elementary schools or high schools than like colleges. When, in 1898, the Brockport trustees considered candidates for the principalship, their record book listed twenty-one candidates. Of the twenty-one, ten were public school principals or city superintendents. Only two were members

of college faculties.²⁰ The normal schools were for the public schools. They were controlled by the authorities who controlled the public schools. They were staffed by public school teachers and administrators, and managed as public schools were managed.

Context: Management, Efficiency, Science

The centralization of control of New York State's normal schools cannot be explained without considering the context in which it proceeded. Society's "search for order" led to greater control.²¹ The rise of business management provided an inspiration for school administrators. The centralization of the management of business and industry management suggested that it would be appropriate for schools, and central control of schools in Europe provided examples. One goal of some progressives was efficiency. A science of education promised efficiency, and brought with it standardization of schooling, of organization and curriculum.

Centralization of control, and the development of staff and line positions in private enterprise had started with railroads. They had started as short, disconnected lines, without coordinated schedules, with noninterchangeable rolling stock--passenger and freight cars and locomotives. But by 1850 or thereabouts railroads were being consolidated, and had become the first big businesses in the United States. The need for coordination was clear; a delay in Dunkirk could affect a departure from Albany. Telegraphs could make immediate

coordination possible. (Ezra Cornell, of whom we most often think in connection with his namesake university, had pioneered that and profited from it.) Railroading had become complex; the first managers, talented enough but not professional full time railroad men, were replaced by professional managers. Expert knowledge of rolling stock, road beds, billing, and purchasing was too great for one man to encompass, and best provided by staff specialists at the railroad's headquarters. Centralization and specialization would appear in manufacturing as large scale production developed.²² Municipal reformers also advocated the employment of experts-- some now refer to them as "bureaucrats"-- and centralization of authority and responsibility.

In 1875, William Howard Payne, who was then a superintendent of Adrian, Michigan schools and who was to become the first university professor of education, had written:

... Organization implies subordination. If there is to be a plan, someone must devise it, while others execute it.... For one man who can design a house, there are a thousand able only to lay the brick and stone as directed.

... It is thus seen that the work of instruction follows the law which prevails in all other industries-- differentiation, classification, system... some one man is held responsible for the general result; so in an extended system of instruction there should be a responsible head... vested with sufficient authority to keep all subordinates in their places, and at their assigned tasks....²³

Some educators knew of the centralization of control of schools in Europe. In 1873 James McCosh, president of Princeton, a recent immigrant from Great Britain, speaking before the NEA,

had spoken regretfully of the lack of the work of "highly educated inspectors,"²⁴ and a scattering of other comments, mostly favorable, appeared.

If school administration was to be seen as "professional" management, like the management of industry, it followed for many that the authority of the manager should be enhanced, the authority of lay school boards and trustees diminished. That tendency was general at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. One result was the diminishment of the power of the normal school boards of trustees. As an assistant commissioner would later write,

Local boards were established when these institutions were first organized and before the State board of regents had general supervision of all educational matters throughout the state. Since the educational work of the state was unified and the State board of regents was made the general legislative body of the State, there is not the reason for local boards in charge of educational institutions that previously existed. You will readily understand, however, how difficult it is to abolish local boards after they have once been established.²⁵

"Progressive" is usually thought of by educators as "progressive education," which is thought of as John Dewey's. But even within education "progressivism" had several meanings, several thrusts.²⁶ The one most familiar to us was the intent to preserve and enhance the freedom of the individual; we think of Dewey as its foremost advocate. But another effort was to secure "efficiency." The effort was not new; at the beginning of the 1880s, in the days of the monitorial schools, it was laudable for a school to be like a factory, and "efficiency"

had been most desirable.²⁷

In the 1910s the notions of factory "efficiency" and business management gained enormous support, both from influential educators and from journalists writing for the mostly new popular magazines. The story of this popularization is the subject of Education and the Cult of Efficiency by Raymond E. Callahan.²⁸

Before the turn of the century, visionaries had foreseen a unified "social science," which was to provide a base of wisdom for prescriptions of all social problems, all social issues.²⁹ A part of this "social science" was, logically, a "science of education." By early 1900s a "science of education" seemed to some to have been formed, or at least to be within easy reach. Obviously, a science of education would enhance school efficiency. If there was indeed a "science of education," then surely it would encompass teacher preparation, and the normal schools.

Beyond the centralization of control and efficiency, perhaps as their corollary, there was standardization, an aid to centralization and the application of the science of education. In 1916 Charles Hubbard Judd, foremost advocate of the science of education and head of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, and his colleague Samuel Chester Parker, spelled out a rationale. Standardization, Judd wrote, would help meet the "general demand in all social institutions for higher efficiency."³⁰ Judd added that the normal schools were

for the state, a proposition later expressed by a Fredonia principal; the normal school was not for the benefit of its students.³¹ That would be echoed as late as 1932 by a normal principal: "... The public's interest is in training you to be a successful teacher of children. Your interests are incidental, the children's needs and society's protection remains paramount."³²

Beginning about 1885 school administrators, particularly the superintendents of big city school systems, developed what they thought of as the "one best system," an orderly, systematic mode of schooling.³³ Students were "classified," schools were "graded," and curricula were made uniform, often following that published in 1862 by Superintendent William Harvey Wells in Chicago. ("Grading" would be extended, in our view nonsensically, into the one room country schools.)

Andrew Sloan Draper, 1848-1913

Context, however important, however pressing and pervasive, does not by itself account for events: Individuals are involved, not only as affected but as effecting. More than anyone else's, the efforts of Andrew Sloan Draper strengthened the centralization of authority over New York State education.³⁴ Draper, Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1886-1892, and Commissioner of Schools, 1904-1913, was one of the shapers and promoters of "the one best system." Born in rural New York, he had attended Albany Academy, taught for one year, attended

law school in 1870-71, practiced law, and, a loyal Republican, had been a member of the State Assembly. President Arthur appointed him as judge of the Alabama Court of Claims (settling claims for losses from the Confederate commerce raider Alabama) then Draper decided to become state superintendent of schools.

Superintendent, State of New York

The office did not seek the man. "... I went about getting it. It did not come unexpectedly and was not urged upon me. I started a canvas for it...." Winning a majority in the Republican caucus, the election by the legislature was a "formality."³⁵ As state superintendent of schools Draper "put [party] politics behind him."³⁶ But Draper was a master politician always, skilled in the wiles of the politician, in the marshalling of supporting forces, and in negotiation when that would serve his purposes. As Superintendent, from 1886 until 1892, he reorganized and regularized. Teacher licensing examinations, administered by local administrators, were standardized. Authority for teacher training classes in academies and high schools was transferred from the Regents to the Superintendent: Draper prescribed a standard course of study for the training classes. Apparently he gained some authority to apportion funds among the normal schools.³⁷ Horner wrote that:

With characteristic frankness and directness Superintendent Draper called attention to weaknesses in the administration of the normal school system. He found haphazard entrance requirements, over-emphasis upon partnership relations between the state and the

- HWB:BC - 15 -

localities where normal schools were located, and uncertain objectives in the various courses of study. He held that the terms of school, the conditions of admission, the courses of study, the division of work among teachers, the methods taught, the practice work employed, and the qualifications for graduation should be substantially the same for all the schools.... He was able to report in 1888 that a uniform entrance examination for ³⁸ the normal schools ... had been established....

Draper's term as superintendent of schools ended in 1892. He did not seek reelection, perhaps because, as Horner suggests, he foresaw the conflict that would follow the adoption of the new state constitution of 1894. ³⁹

Superintendent of Instruction, Cleveland

Intending at first to resume the practice of law, he accepted instead the position of superintendent of instruction in Cleveland, Ohio. The Cleveland school system had just been reorganized, with a new, smaller, board of education, and a "director," in effect a business manager, and a "professional leader" (Draper) in charge of instruction. In his first year in Cleveland Draper established a merit system for selection of teachers, and seventy-five teachers were dismissed for incompetence. There was a new course of study, record keeping was improved, and manual training was introduced. ⁴⁰

President, University of Illinois

In 1894, after two years in Cleveland, Draper resigned to become president of the University of Illinois. (Administrators then, as Tyack has pointed out, moved often

enough between public and higher education.) He would remain there until 1904. The University's administration was reorganized and a chain of command clearly outlined. To illustrate Draper's administrative style, a University colleague told of a pronouncement of Draper to the University trustees:

One time when the Trustees were discussing details, as all trustees are likely to do at times, he (Draper) announced in that positive way of his: "Bodies legislate: individuals administer; I'll attend to that." There is a whole philosophy of administration summed up in a few words....⁴¹

Draper had a strong sense of order. He liked things "ship shape." His administration was a textbook example of the application of business management methods to education.⁴² The University's relations to the governor were cordial and the state legislature was generous to Draper.

During the decade of Draper's presidency there were a dozen new buildings on the University of Illinois' Champagne-Urbana campus. Chicago schools of pharmacy, medicine, and dentistry was annexed to the University. (Draper assumed that these would be self-supporting. But this resulted in a debt which would plague his successors.) Enrollments and the number of faculty members more than quadrupled, the University's budget almost quadrupled, and the number of library books was more than doubled. As president of the University of Illinois and after, Draper found time to write several books and articles.

Commissioner, New York State

In New York State there was governmental control of schools

Almost from the beginning, with the establishment of the Regents in 1784. The Regents had acquired control of higher education and academies and, since the academies provided teacher training, of teacher training. Control of public education, at first the common schools and later also the high schools, was vested in the Department of Public Instruction, which, of course, controlled the normal schools. The Act of 1904 was intended to unify control of schools, combining the powers and duties of the Regents with that of the superintendent, and creating the position of commissioner.

Draper returned to New York State as Commissioner to organize the new State Education Department and to carry on the work he had begun as State Superintendent. There was no issue in the administration of public education he did not discuss or in his official capacity treat in some form. Draper's accomplishments are part of the history of the centralization and bureaucratization of control of the public schools.

Education Department Bulletin No. 505, published in 1911, was a compilation of "laws, regulations, courses of study and all other matters" concerning the normal schools. By 1911 centralization seems to have been accomplished. The power of local boards had been truncated. While they had "immediate supervision and management of said schools," and managed buildings and grounds, their decisions were subject to the approval of the commissioner. The commissioner set student

admission requirements: As high school or academy students, applicants were to have studied English for four years, history for three years, a foreign language for at least two years, and science for two years. Applicants for admission to the normal schools were to apply to the State Education Department, using a form it provided. The normal school course of study for elementary teachers, by then requiring two years of study, had been "professionalized" and standardized.⁴³ For prospective elementary school teachers at all normal schools, it consisted of twelve "methods" courses (vocal music, algebra and geometry, history, drawing, etc.), three background courses (psychology, "principles," "school economy") a course in logic, and student teaching.⁴⁴ There were by then special courses--as examples, agriculture at Cortland, music at Fredonia--but these courses had also been prescribed. Normal school calendars had also been standardized. Classes were to begin on the second Wednesday of September and were to continue for thirty-nine weeks. Commencements were to be held only in June. The Commissioner "prescribed" courses of study, set teacher salaries, and staff appointments were subject to his approval. Centralization was nearly complete.⁴⁵ It is to be noted that no proposal by Draper, ever the politician, was ever rejected by the Board of Regents.

Normal School Centralization to State University of New York

Centralization

Centralized control of the normal schools lasted for a

variety of reasons, political and administrative. In a progressive era, centralization of control in the name of efficiency was often accepted. In the 1920s, under progressive governor Alfred E. Smith, "efficiency" and "economy" were bywords. Depression and war diverted attention from schooling.

Centralization of control of the normal schools and their reform had been important to Draper: The normal schools seemed far less important to his successors. Commissioners and the Regents competed for power. Rural schools were the subject of surveys and efforts to improve them. The Commissioners' control of the normal schools was delegated to less influential officials in the State Department of Education, probably without interest in or ability to modify their administrative control.

To support individuals' rights was to be "progressive." To favor efficiency and governmental economy (and centralization) was also to be progressive, even though the two ideals could and did conflict. Theodore Roosevelt as governor (1898-1900) was a progressive in both these senses. His successors as governor, Benjamin B. Odell, Jr. and Frank W. Higgins, also were progressives in the latter sense: A standard text says that Odell's administration was "characterized by efficiency and economy."⁴⁶ Charles Evans Hughes is described as "progressive in the age of progressivism."⁴⁷ In a progressive era, during progressive state administrations, centralization of control was likely to endure.

Alfred E. Smith, New York's governor in the 1920s, was

a progressive in both the senses of "progressive" as it is used here. Paula Eldot, writing rather recently, argues that Smith's first concern was with efficiency and economy, his second with "direct democracy" and social justice. She writes that:

... His unwavering commitment to efficiency and economy, placed Governor Smith in the ranks of progressive reformers of government. They assumed that efficient and economical operation required the concentration of power in a strong executive with strong control over administration....⁴⁸

As governor (1928-32) Franklin D. Roosevelt's early concern was fiscal management, and much of this later concerned his candidacy for the presidency. Administrative and organizational changes seem not to have been an important part of his agenda, and control of the normal schools was nearly as centralized as it had been in 1913 at the time of Draper's death.

In the early 1920s those in Albany directly responsible for direction of the normal schools were obscure "chiefs," sometimes not listed in the Annual Reports. Such interest as there was probably resulted in the further tightening of control: A Regents' visit in 1924, which found many flaws in the normal schools, led to the replacement in 1926 of local boards by boards of "visitors," with the power only to nominate new principals, and that subject to the approval of the commissioner and contingent upon the action of the Regents. It may also have led to the appointment in 1926 of Ned H. Dearborn as "director" of the normal schools.

During the 1920s, especially the later 1920s, the normal schools acquired larger numbers of faculty members with degrees;

in 1925 fifty percent of the normal schools' faculties had no degrees; by 1933 only nine percent of their faculties had no degree. Faculty salaries were increased; principals' maximum salary was as much as \$6,500. The last of the normal schools' "academic departments" and high schools were closed. The courses of study were expanded to three or four years, and the normal school in Buffalo became New York State College for Teachers at Buffalo. (Albany had been New York State Normal College since 1890.) The other normal schools would be retitled some years later. There was faculty participation in curriculum revision, the resulting syllabi apparently having been mandatory: As he later recalled, as late as 1947 President Frederick W. Crumb of New York State College for Teachers at Potsdam emphatically objected to mandatory item-by-item syllabi.⁵⁰

Hermann W. Cooper was appointed to the State Education Department in 1931, and in 1933 became Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education and Certification. To the extent that precedents for the governance of the normal schools were transferred to SUNY upon its founding in 1948 by one man, that man was Cooper, who would become SUNY's first Executive Dean for Teacher Education, upon the recommendation of Alvin C. Eurich, the first president of SUNY.⁵¹ Cooper would not retire from SUNY until 1962. His later career in the State Education Department and in State University of New York, beyond the scope of this paper, is deserving of careful study.

Before coming to New York State Cooper had been a high

school principal and Director of Research in Delaware. In 1925 he was at Geneseo as head of the Education Department and Director of Training from 1929 until he was appointed to the Department of Education in 1931 as principal at Fredonia.⁵²

Conclusion

Although every generalization has its exceptions, it is worth as a generalization to say that the history of control and administration in New York has been, from the establishment of the Regents until at least mid-twentieth century, a process of centralization, and that in general "professional" control superseded lay control. The control of the normal schools was one phase of that centralization. Others were the establishment of the post of rural school commissioner and the city superintendents.

In New York State several state normal schools had been academies, and were initially controlled, subject to the state superintendent, by local boards, some of them having been the boards of the precedent academies. Even the chartered academies had been to some degree subject to control by the Regents. Some measure of control of the normal schools by the state superintendent of schools was a direct and immediate consequence of appropriations for the normal schools' support. Control by the State Department of Education had already increased before Andrew S. Draper became Superintendent of Schools and later Commissioner of Schools. That centralized control, established

in an era in which "efficiency," economy, and centralization were highly commendable, continued beyond the progressive era during the administration of Governor Alfred E. Smith, and endured with only slight attention until the establishment of SUNY. Hermann W. Cooper, Assistant Commissioner for Normal Schools, became one of SUNY's first administrators, as Executive Dean for Teacher Education. At least initially, the teachers colleges governance in SUNY seemed to follow much the same pattern as that by the State Education Department and the commissioner.⁵³

To the degree to which the administration of State University of New York has been decentralized, decentralization has been by reversing the precedents set in the management of the normal schools, precedents that begun at least a century ago.

End Notes

¹Governance of faculty and students on individual campuses, also a matter of interest, is another topic.

²George Frederick Miller, The Academy System of the State of New York (Albany: J.B. Lyon, 1922, repr. 1969), *passim*.

³Saul Sack, History of Education in Pennsylvania (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1963). pp. 526-27, 539, 541-42.

⁴Charles Hubbard Judd and Samuel Chester Parker, Problems Involved in Standardizing State Normal Schools, Bureau of Education, Department of Interior, 1916, No. 12, p. 12.

⁵Secretary's Book of Records for the Brockport Collegiate Institute, 1841-54, p. 76.

⁶Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The Democratic Experience (New York: Random House, 1973), pp. 273-75 and *passim*.

⁷John Ford Ohles, "The Historical Development of State University of New York College at Fredonia as Representative of the Evolution of Teacher Education in the State University of New York." dissertation, SUNY Buffalo, 1964, p.120.

⁸Among Secretaries of the Regents who were Albany's board members were Gideon Hawley, onetime State Superintendent of Schools, and David Murray, newly returned from serving in Japan as "superintendent of schools," i.e. undersecretary in the Ministry of Education, where he had been a strong proponent of centralization. The control and governance of what is now State University of Albany followed a different course and will not be included here.

⁹State Normal and Training School, Brockport, New York Letterbook, p.12. Note that there was already in existence a printed form for reports to Albany.

¹⁰Ibid., p.25. The office of New York State Superintendent of schools was created in 1812, abolished in 1921. The Secretary of State was ex-officio superintendent of schools until 1854, when the Office of Public Instruction, to oversee common schools was established. In 1904 the position of the Superintendent was replaced by that of the Commissioner of Education, who, not incidentally, had far greater power.

¹¹Ibid., pp.67, 69.

¹²Ibid., p. 35.

¹³Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁴State Normal ... Letterbook, pp. 147-49, 154-63, 173.

¹⁵Carey W. Brush, "The Cortland Normal Response to Changing Needs and Professional Standards, 1866-1942," dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961, p. 104.

¹⁶State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tewnty-Seventh Annual Report, 1881, p. 31.

¹⁷Brush, op. cit., pp. 114-15.

¹⁸Thomas E. Finegan, Teacher Training Agencies, Vol. 2, Eleventh Annual Report of the State Department of Education (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1917), pp. 232-33.

¹⁹ State Normal ... Letterbook, p. 138. Two candidates were normal school faculty members. One was a normal school president. One candidate was a women.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 78. The circumstances leading to identical appropriations for greatly dissimilar schools have been left unexplored.

²¹ This of course is the central theme of Robert Wiebe, Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967).

²² Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., "The Railroads: Pioneers in Modern Corporate Management." In History of American Management, ed. James P. Paughman (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969)

²³ William Howard Payne, Chapters on School Supervision (Cincinnati, 1875), pp. 13-14. 17.

²⁴ James McCosh, "Upper Schools," NEA Proceedings, 1873, p. 20.

²⁵ Thomas E. Finegan, quoted in Judd and Parker, p. 34.

²⁶ H. Warren Button and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., History of Education and Culture in America (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989), p. 78. Our distinctions are based on the work of David J. Hogan. For divergent "progressive" views on curriculum, see Herbert M. Kliebard, The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958 (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).

²⁷ Button and Provenzo, op. cit., p.78.

²⁸ (Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1962). "Efficiency" in education is the subject of William B. Eaton, ed., History, Politics and Methodology in American Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia U., 1990). Button's conceptualization, differing somewhat from Callahan's, appeared in a brief account in Frank P. Besag and Jack L. Nelson, The Foundations of Education: Stasis and Change (New York: Random House, 1984), pp. 54-71.

²⁹ Luther Lee Bernard and Jesse Bernard, Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States (New York: Russell and Russell, 1945).

³⁰ Judd and Parker, p. 12.

³¹ Ibid., p. 22.

³² Principal Leslie P. Gregory, Fredonia, quoted in Ohles, p. 242.

³³The development of the "one best system" is the central topic of David B. Tyack's book of that name (Cambridge: Harvard, 1974).

³⁴Harlan Hoyt Horner, The Life and Works of Andrew Sloan Draper (U. of Ill., 1934), is a fulsome informative biography. Most of our information on Draper comes from it. There is some additional information on Draper in Tyack, op. cit., Raymond E. Callahan, The Superintendent of Schools--A Historical Analysis (St. Louis: Washington U. (1966) ERIC 010 410.

³⁵Horner, pp. 67-68. State superintendents and commissioners have had quasi-judicial duties, for which Draper was qualified by experience.

³⁶Ibid., p. 68.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 177-78.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 69-70.

³⁹Ibid., p. 162.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 90-92.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 117-18.

⁴²Callahan, The Superintendent of Schools, passim.

⁴³Judd and Parker, pp. 19-20. This is essentially the high school course of study that had been recommended by the Committee of Ten in 1893.

⁴⁴The near-complete "professionalization" of teacher preparation and almost exclusive emphasis on methods may be more understandable if it is seen in having been in an era in which there were free-standing schools of law and medicine, also purely professional.

⁴⁵Education Department Bulletin No. 505, Oct. 15, 1911.

⁴⁶David M. Ellis, et. al., A History of New York State (Ithaca: Cornell U. Press, 1967), p. 382.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 385.

⁴⁸Paula Eldot, Governor Alfred E. Smith: The Politician as Reformer (New York: Garland, 1983), pp.27-28. Oscar Handlin, Al Smith and His America (Boston: Little Brown, 1958), pp.90111, makes the same general point.

⁴⁹ W[illiam] Charles Lahey, The Potsdam Tradition (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 209.

⁵⁰ Alvin C. Eurich to Francis G. Spaulding, undated, in Oliver Cromwell Carmichael, Jr., New York Establishes a State University (Nashville: Vanderbilt U. Press, 1955), p. 4C5.

⁵¹ Cooper does not appear in standard sources of biography. This information is from Ohles, pp. 389-90. Ohles interviewed Cooper in 1962.

⁵² As a single example, when Oneonta's Acting President James Frost declined to put an unfinished dormitory into use in 1951, he was overruled by SUNY's central office. The incident is described briefly in Carey W. Brush, In Honor and Good Faith: A History of the State University College at Oneonta (Oneonta: Student-Faculty Association, 1965), p. 248.

⁵³ Precedents set in the management of the normal schools is the theme of Betsey C. Corby, "The Centralization of Educational Administration in the New York State Normal Schools, 1863-1917," dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo, 1993.